

# Field induced phase segregation and collective excitations of a trapped spinor Bose-Einstein condensate

W.-J. Huang and S.-C. Gou  
*Department of Physics,*  
*National Changhua University of Education,*  
*Changhua 50058, Taiwan*  
 (May 31, 1999)

A hydrodynamic description is used to study the zero-temperature properties of a trapped spinor Bose-Einstein condensate in the presence of a uniform magnetic field. We show that, in the case of antiferromagnetic spin-spin interaction, the polar and ferromagnetic configurations of the ground state can coexist in the trap. These two phases are spatially segregated in such a way that the polar state occupies the inner part while the ferromagnetic state occupies the outer part of the atomic cloud. We also derive a set of coupled hydrodynamic equations for the number density and spin density excitations of the system. It is shown that these equations can be analytically solved for the system in an isotropic harmonic trap and a constant magnetic field. Remarkably, the related low lying excitation spectra are completely determined by the solutions in the region occupied by the polar state. We find that, within the Thomas-Fermi approximation, the presence of a constant magnetic field does not change the excitation spectra which still possess the similar form of that obtained by Stringari.

The recent realization of Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in trapped atomic gases has inspired enormous interest in the theoretical and experimental studies of inhomogeneous interacting Bose gases [1–3]. More recently, Stamper-Kurn *et al.* have successfully produced a BEC of  $^{23}\text{Na}$  atoms in an optical dipole trap [4]. In their experiment, a new kind of Bose-condensed system, namely, the spinor BEC which is characterized by the three hyperfine spin states  $|F=1, m_F=\pm 1, 0\rangle$ , has been realized. A remarkable feature of such a system is that, unlike the magnetically trapped BEC, the spin-flip collisions between atoms allow population exchange among hyperfine states without causing any trap loss. This has opened up the possibilities to explore the Bose-condensed systems having internal degrees of freedom in which the  $U(1)$  gauge symmetry as well as the rotational  $SO(3)$  symmetry in spin space are both involved.

In the spinor BEC, the spin-spin interaction between atoms can be approximated by the spin exchange term  $\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{S}$  [5] where  $\mathbf{S} = S_x \mathbf{e}_x + S_y \mathbf{e}_y + S_z \mathbf{e}_z$  is the spin operator. In such circumstances, the sign of the spin-exchange coupling strength may play a crucial role in determining the ground state configurations. For example, in the cases of negative (ferromagnetic) coupling strength, atoms of

same spin orientation in the condensate tend to attract each other against the repulsive binary scatterings which give rise to the density-density interaction. The situation is equally complicated for the cases of positive (antiferromagnetic) coupling strength in which atoms of same spin orientation tend to repel each other. The competition between the density-density and spin-spin interactions evidently lead to an intriguing scenario of the spin dynamics of the spinor BEC that is revealed by certain complex ground state structures [5–8].

In the previous theoretical studies, the zero-temperature properties of the spinor BEC have been considered exclusively either in a trap [5,7] or in a uniform magnetic field [6,8]. It is of great theoretical interest to ask that how these physical properties are affected when the confining trap and the external magnetic field are both present. In this paper, we use the hydrodynamic treatment to probe into this issue with a special emphasis on the case of antiferromagnetic spin-spin interaction. We show that part of our results are related to the formation of spin domains in the ground state of the spinor BEC which has been reported very recently by Stenger *et al.* [9].

We begin by considering the generalized Gross-Pitaevski Hamiltonian

$$H = \int d^3r \left\{ \frac{1}{2m} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + V(\mathbf{r}) |\Phi|^2 - \Omega \cdot (\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi) + \frac{1}{2} g_n |\Phi|^4 + \frac{1}{2} g_s |\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi|^2 \right\}, \quad (\hbar = 1) \quad (1)$$

which describes the classical part of the spinor BEC [5,6]. Here  $V(\mathbf{r})$  is the trapping potential and  $\Omega$  is the Larmor frequency which is proportional to the magnetic field. For simplicity, we shall assume that the magnetic field is applied along the  $z$ -axis, i.e.,  $\Omega = \Omega_L \mathbf{e}_z$ . The coupling constants  $g_n$  and  $g_s$  characterizing the density-density and spin-spin interaction, respectively, are given by  $g_n = 4\pi a_n/m$  and  $g_s = 4\pi a_s/m$ , with  $a_n$  and  $a_s$  being the corresponding  $s$ -wave scattering lengths. Unlike that for the scalar BEC, the order parameter  $\Phi$  for the present system is vector-like whose components are represented by three classical fields,  $\phi_+$ ,  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_-$ , corresponding to the condensates in the hyperfine states  $|F=1, m_F=1, 0, -1\rangle$ , respectively. In the presence of a magnetic field, there are two classes of symmetry transformations admitted by the system, namely, the  $U(1)$

phase symmetry and the  $SO(2)$  rotational symmetry about the direction of the field. It can be shown that the underlying symmetry group of Eq.(1) is  $U(1) \otimes U(1)$  such that the Hamiltonian is invariant under the transformation:

$$\Phi = (\phi_+, \phi_0, \phi_-)^T \rightarrow (\phi_+ e^{i\theta_+}, \phi_0 e^{i\theta_0}, \phi_- e^{i\theta_-})^T. \quad (2)$$

Here the superscript  $T$  stands for transpose and the parameterized phase angles satisfy the relation  $\theta_+ + \theta_- = 2\theta_0$ .

We first examine the ground state configuration for the case of ferromagnetic coupling ( $g_s < 0$ ), which is in essence identical with that of a scalar BEC. In order to minimize the ground state energy, we apply the inequality for spin-one systems, i.e.,  $|\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi| \leq |\Phi|^2 \equiv \rho(\mathbf{r})$ . Obviously, the contribution of all the spin-dependent parts in Eq.(1),

$$-\Omega_L (\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi) + \frac{1}{2} g_s |\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi|^2, \quad (3)$$

is minimized by choosing  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = |\Phi|^2$ . Now since  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = |\phi_+|^2 - |\phi_-|^2$  as we have adopted the spin matrices in the  $|m_F = 1, 0, -1\rangle$  representation, it follows immediately that  $\phi_0 = \phi_- = 0$  and  $\phi_+ \neq 0$ . Hence the ground state configuration based on the hydrodynamic description is given by  $\Phi_g = (\sqrt{\rho_0(\mathbf{r})} e^{i\theta_0(\mathbf{r})}, 0, 0)^T$ , where  $\rho_0$  and  $\nabla\theta_0/m$  are identified as the local condensate density and superfluid velocity, respectively. As we wish to deal with a system having fixed total particle number  $N = \int d^3r \rho_0(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\rho_0$  and  $\theta_0$  must be chosen to minimize the free energy

$$F[\Phi_g] = \int d^3r \left\{ \frac{1}{2m} (\nabla \sqrt{\rho_0})^2 + \frac{1}{2m} \rho_0 (\nabla \theta_0)^2 + [V(\mathbf{r}) - \Omega_L - \mu] \rho_0 + \frac{1}{2} g_1 \rho_0^2 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu$  is the chemical potential, and  $g_1 = g_n + g_s$ . Obviously,  $F[\Phi_g]$  can be minimized only when  $\nabla\theta_0 = 0$ , that is,  $\theta_0$  must be position-independent. In the Thomas-Fermi (TF) limit, the kinetic energy term  $(\nabla \sqrt{\rho_0})^2 / 2m$  is neglected and the minimization of the free energy can be achieved by letting

$$\rho_0 = \begin{cases} g_1^{-1} [\mu + \Omega_L - V(\mathbf{r})], & \mu + \Omega_L \geq V(\mathbf{r}) \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}. \quad (5)$$

We next consider the collective motion of the order parameter. In doing so, we assume that the collective modes deviate slightly from the ground state by  $\delta\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , i.e.,  $\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \Phi_g(\mathbf{r}) + \delta\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . Substituting  $\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$  into the motion equation of the system

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi = \left[ -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{r}) - \mu - \Omega_L S_z \right] \Phi + g_n |\Phi|^2 \Phi + g_s (\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi) \cdot \mathbf{S} \Phi, \quad (6)$$

it is easy to check that the small fluctuation parts  $\delta\phi_0$  and  $\delta\phi_-$  lead to two independent modes whose spectra are determined by the one-particle Schrödinger equations with effective potentials  $V(\mathbf{r}) + g_1 \rho_0 - \mu$  and  $V(\mathbf{r}) + (g_n - g_s) \rho_0 + \Omega_L - \mu$ , respectively. In the homogeneous case, each mode is known to have a free-particle-like spectrum with a gap [6,8]. The hydrodynamic(-like) mode corresponding to the Bose-condensed component  $\phi_+$  can be obtained by considering order parameter of the form

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t) = (\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)} e^{i\theta(\mathbf{r}, t)}, 0, 0)^T, \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho(\mathbf{r}, t) = \rho_0(\mathbf{r}) + \delta\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . Substituting Eq.(7) into Eq.(6) and following the analytical approach given by Stringari [10], it is straightforward to show that the density fluctuation  $\delta\rho$  satisfies the equation of motion

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \delta\rho = \frac{g_1}{m} \nabla \cdot [\rho_0 \nabla \delta\rho]. \quad (8)$$

Accordingly, the low lying collective excitation spectrum is identical with that of the universal excitation spectrum obtained by Stringari [10].

Of particular interest is the antiferromagnetic case ( $g_s > 0$ ). Clearly, the two terms given by Eq.(3) are minimized only when  $\Phi^\dagger S_x \Phi = \Phi^\dagger S_y \Phi = 0$  or, explicitly,  $\phi_+^* \phi_0 + \phi_0^* \phi_- = \phi_0^* \phi_+ + \phi_-^* \phi_0 = 0$ . Furthermore, the minimum is achieved if we impose that  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = \Omega_L / g_s > 0$ . When  $\phi_0 \neq 0$ , by using Eq.(2), we may assume without loss of generality that  $\phi_0$  is real. This assumption implies that  $\phi_+^* = -\phi_-$  and, as a consequence,  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = 0$  which apparently violates the imposed condition  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = \Omega_L / g_s$ . We thus conclude that  $\phi_0$  must be identically equal to zero and are led to the so-called polar state for the condensate [5]:  $\Phi_g^{(P)}(\mathbf{r}) = (|\phi_+^{(P)}| e^{i\theta_+}, 0, |\phi_-^{(P)}| e^{i\theta_-})^T$ , where  $|\phi_\pm^{(P)}|^2 = \rho_0 (1 \pm \Omega_L / \rho_0 g_s) / 2$ . Note that in this region the condition  $\rho_0(\mathbf{r}) \geq \Omega_L / g_s$  is required in order to keep  $|\phi_-^{(P)}|^2 \geq 0$ . On the other hand, if  $\rho_0(\mathbf{r}) < \Omega_L / g_s$ , the condition  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi = \Omega_L / g_s > 0$  can never be fulfilled and we must choose  $\Phi$  in such a way that  $\Phi^\dagger S_z \Phi$  is as close to  $\Omega_L / g_s$  as possible. In view of the inequality,  $|\Phi^\dagger \mathbf{S} \Phi| \leq |\Phi|^2$ , we conclude that the ground state configuration is described by the ferromagnetic state [5]:  $\Phi_g^{(F)}(\mathbf{r}) = (\rho_0 e^{i\theta_0}, 0, 0)^T$ . We thus see that when  $g_s > 0$ , the two different ground state configurations  $\Phi_g^{(P)}$  and  $\Phi_g^{(F)}$  coexist and the phase boundary  $\mathbf{r}_b$  is determined by  $\rho_0(\mathbf{r}_b) = \Omega_L / g_s$ . The free energy of such a structure of coexistence can be described by

$$F[\Phi_g] = \int_{\text{polar}} d^3r \left[ \frac{1}{2m} (\nabla \sqrt{\rho_0})^2 \frac{1}{1 - (\Omega_L / \rho_0 g_s)^2} - \frac{\Omega_L^2}{2g_s} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{\text{ferro}} d^3r \left[ \frac{1}{2m} (\nabla \sqrt{\rho_0})^2 - \Omega_L \rho_0 + \frac{1}{2} g_s \rho_0^2 \right] \\
& + \int d^3r \left[ (V(\mathbf{r}) - \mu) \rho_0 + \frac{1}{2} g_n \rho_0^2 \right], \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set  $\nabla \theta_{+0}(\mathbf{r}) = \nabla \theta_{-0}(\mathbf{r}) = 0$  which serves as the necessary condition for minimizing the free energy. We subsequently consider the minimization condition,  $\delta F / \delta \rho_0 = 0$ , for both regions. In the TF limit, the kinetic energy term is ignored and hence we are able to write down the density profile in both regions:

$$\rho_0(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} g_n^{-1} [\mu - V(\mathbf{r})], & \text{polar;} \\ g_1^{-1} [\mu + \Omega_L - V(\mathbf{r})], & \text{ferromagnetic.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

For simplicity, we assume an isotropic harmonic trap  $V_{\text{har}}(r) = m\omega_0^2 r^2 / 2$ . Thus, the two important length scales of the density profile Eq.(10), namely, the phase boundary and the radius of the atomic cloud are given by  $r_b = \omega_0^{-1} [2(\mu - \Omega_L g_n / g_s) / m]^{1/2}$  and  $R = \omega_0^{-1} [2(\mu + \Omega_L) / m]^{1/2}$ , respectively. In this case, one sees that the  $\phi_-$  component is restricted in the region of  $0 \leq r \leq r_b$  while the  $\phi_+$  component exists ubiquitously in the atomic cloud. We note that a similar structure has been reported in Refs. [9,11], in the case that the quadratic Zeeman energy is almost canceled. The chemical potential can be obtained by fixing the total particle number with the density profile led by  $V_{\text{har}}(r)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
N = \frac{8\pi}{15g_1} \left( \frac{2}{\omega_0^2 m} \right)^{3/2} \left[ \frac{g_s}{g_n} \left( \mu - \frac{g_n}{g_s} \Omega_L \right)^{5/2} \right. \\
\left. + (\mu + \Omega_L)^{5/2} \right]. \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

This equation provides a complicated mathematical relation between the chemical potential  $\mu$  and the total particle number  $N$ . However, when the magnetic field is absent, we again obtain the well-known 5/2-power-law for the trapped scalar BEC:  $N = a_{HO} (2\mu / \omega_0)^{5/2} / 15a_n$ , where  $a_{HO} = (m\omega_0)^{-1/2}$  is the characteristic length of the harmonic trap.

In order to obtain the low lying excitation spectrum of the configuration described in Eq.(10), we let

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{cases} (\sqrt{\rho} e^{i\theta_+}, \delta\phi_0, \sqrt{\rho_-} e^{i\theta_-})^T, & \text{polar} \\ (\sqrt{\rho} e^{i\theta_+}, \delta\phi_0, \delta\phi_-)^T, & \text{ferromagnetic} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Here  $\rho_{\pm}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \rho_{0\pm}(\mathbf{r}) + \delta\rho_{\pm}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , where  $\rho_{0\pm}(\mathbf{r})$  denote the equilibrium particle densities for the  $\phi_{\pm}$  fields in the configuration of Eq.(10) and  $\delta\rho_{\pm}(\mathbf{r}, t)$  are the corresponding density fluctuations. In the ferromagnetic region the respective linearized equations for the fluctuations  $\delta\rho_+$ ,  $\delta\phi_0$ , and  $\delta\phi_-$  are again decoupled and are, in

fact, exactly the same as those for the case of ferromagnetic coupling. In the polar region, the fluctuation  $\delta\phi_0$  also decouples from  $\delta\rho_{\pm}$ . In fact, we have derived the corresponding linearized equation and found that it is not analytically solvable in the presence of a parabolic trapping potential. Here we shall not discuss that equation which is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, it would be instructive to point out that in the homogenous case, the motion equation of  $\delta\phi_0$  is solvable and predicts the existence of a massive mode with a gap equal to  $\Omega_L$  [6,8]. Again, we follow the steps in deriving Eq.(8) and obtain the following linearized coupled equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 \delta\rho_+}{\partial t^2} &= \nabla \cdot \left\{ \frac{\rho_{0+}}{m} [g_1 \nabla \delta\rho_+ + (g_n - g_s) \nabla \delta\rho_-] \right\}, \\
\frac{\partial^2 \delta\rho_-}{\partial t^2} &= \nabla \cdot \left\{ \frac{\rho_{0-}}{m} [(g_n - g_s) \nabla \delta\rho_+ + g_1 \nabla \delta\rho_-] \right\}. \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\delta\rho = \delta\rho_+ + \delta\rho_-$  and  $\delta\rho_s = \delta\rho_+ - \delta\rho_-$  which correspond to the fluctuations of number density and spin density respectively. If we further assume that the time dependence of these two quantities are described by  $\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}, t) = \delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) \exp(-i\omega t)$  and  $\delta\rho_s(\mathbf{r}, t) = \delta\rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \exp(-i\omega t)$ , we then obtain the desired hydrodynamic equations for the system:

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega^2 \delta\rho &= -\nabla \cdot \left\{ g_n \frac{\rho_0}{m} \nabla \delta\rho + \frac{\Omega_L}{m} \nabla \delta\rho_s \right\} \\
\omega^2 \delta\rho_s &= -\nabla \cdot \left\{ \frac{g_n \Omega_L}{g_s m} \nabla \delta\rho + g_s \frac{\rho_0}{m} \nabla \delta\rho_s \right\}. \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

We note that when the magnetic field is absent, Eq.(14) reduces to the same result obtained by Ho [5]. On the other hand, if the trap is removed, the density  $\rho_0$  becomes a constant and it is thus easy to see that the excitation frequencies agree with the results given by Ohmi and Machida in the long-wavelength limit [6].

In order to solve Eq.(14) for an isotropic harmonic potential, it is useful to assume solutions of the form:

$$\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) = f(r) Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \delta\rho_s(\mathbf{r}) = f_s(r) Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \quad (15)$$

where  $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$  is the spherical harmonic function. In what follows, we merely substitute the density profile for  $V_{\text{har}}(r)$  in the polar region into Eq.(14) as it will be illustrated later that this density profile alone is sufficient to solve the excitation spectrum of the system. Introducing the dimensionless variable  $x \equiv r/R$ , the coupled equation for  $f(x)$  and  $f_s(x)$  in the polar region ( $0 \leq x \leq r_b/R$ ) is expressed by the following matrix equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A} \left( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{2}{x} \frac{d}{dx} - \frac{l(l+1)}{x^2} \right) \mathbf{f} \\
- \left[ x^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + 4x \frac{d}{dx} - l(l+1) \right] \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f} = 0, \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

where the matrices are given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_L^2 \\ x_L^2/\beta^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon/\beta \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{f} = \begin{pmatrix} f(x) \\ f_s(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

with the parameters defined by  $\epsilon = 2\omega^2/\omega_0^2$ ,  $x_L^2 = 2\omega_L/m\omega_0^2 R^2$  and  $\beta = g_s/g_n$ . Equation (16) can be solved by using the series expansions for the radial functions  $f(x)$  and  $f_s(x)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{u}_k x^{k+l}$  where  $\mathbf{u}_k = (a_k, b_k)^T$ . It is straightforward to show that for  $k \geq -1$ , we have, with the convention  $\mathbf{u}_{-1} = 0$ , the recursion relation

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}_{k+2} = -\frac{\mathbf{B} - k^2 - 2kl - 3k - 2l}{(k+2)(k+2l+3)}\mathbf{u}_k. \quad (17)$$

An immediate consequence of Eq.(17) is that  $\mathbf{u}_k$  vanishes for all odd  $k$ . To solve Eq.(17) for even  $k$  we first work out the eigenvalues  $\lambda_{\pm}$  of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  which are given by  $\lambda_{\pm} = 1 \pm x_L^2/\beta$ . Let  $\mathbf{u}_{\pm}$  be the corresponding eigenvectors of  $\lambda_{\pm}$  and thus for all  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{u}_k = c_k^{(+)}\mathbf{u}_+ + c_k^{(-)}\mathbf{u}_-$ . Accordingly, Eq.(17) becomes

$$\lambda_+ c_{k+2}^{(+)}\mathbf{u}_+ + \lambda_- c_{k+2}^{(-)}\mathbf{u}_- = -\frac{\mathbf{B} - k^2 - 2kl - 3k - 2l}{(k+2)(k+2l+3)} \left( c_k^{(+)}\mathbf{u}_+ + c_k^{(-)}\mathbf{u}_- \right). \quad (18)$$

When  $\beta \neq 1$  ( $g_n \neq g_s$ ), it is obvious that  $\mathbf{u}_{\pm}$  can not be eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{B}$ . A close examination on the behavior of the series in the large order expansion shows that the series must terminate at some  $k$ , otherwise it will diverge at the phase boundary  $r = r_b$ . We therefore conclude that for some  $k = 2n \geq 0$ , the right hand side of Eq.(17) vanishes and thus the solutions to the eigenvalue problems are

$$\mathbf{u}_{2n} = \begin{cases} (a_{2n}, 0)^T, & \epsilon = 4n^2 + 4nl + 6n + 2l; \\ (0, b_{2n})^T, & \epsilon = \beta(4n^2 + 4nl + 6n + 2l) \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

In either case, the sequence of the vectors  $\mathbf{u}_k$  can be determined by the use of Eq.(17) and thus the corresponding eigenfunctions  $\mathbf{f}$  can be obtained. For  $\beta = 1$ , the situation is simpler: Eq.(13) becomes two independent equations for  $\delta\rho_{\pm}$ . A similar analysis shows that Eq.(19) is again valid.

The first mode in Eq.(19) has the spectrum  $\omega_{nl}^{(1)} = \omega_0(2n^2 + 2nl + 3n + l)^{1/2}$  which possesses exactly the same form of the universal spectrum obtained by Stringari [10]. What is noticeable is the spectrum of the second mode  $\omega_{nl}^{(2)} = \omega_0[(2n^2 + 2nl + 3n + l)g_s/g_n]^{1/2}$  which now depends explicitly on the two-body interaction although it has the same  $n, l$  dependence as that of  $\omega_{nl}^{(1)}$ . When the magnetic field is absent the two modes are merely owing to the number density and the spin density fluctuations, respectively. It should be noted that both two sets of dispersion relations given by Eq.(19) do not depend on the magnetic field at all. In other words, the

presence of a constant magnetic field does not change the frequencies of the hydrodynamic modes but indeed mixes up the number density oscillation  $\delta\rho$  and the spin density oscillation  $\delta\rho_s$ . It is also interesting to point out that when  $g_n = g_s$ , we have two independent hydrodynamic equation of the Stringari-type which have the same spectra.

In conclusion, we have investigated the ground state structure of a trapped spinor BEC in the presence of a uniform magnetic field. It is found that the antiferromagnetic spin-spin interaction leads to the coexistence of the polar and ferromagnetic phases in the ground state. For the isotropic harmonic trap the density profile is obtained in the TF limit. Moreover, the linearized equations for the collective modes are derived. We find that the oscillation frequencies of the hydrodynamic modes are completely determined by the linearized equations in the polar region. Within the TF approximation, the spectra of the hydrodynamic modes are shown to be independent of the strength of the magnetic field and possess a form of Stringari-type.

Our studies provide a theoretical treatment for the zero-temperature properties of the trapped spinor BEC. These analyses are, however, limited by the TF approximation and the use of an isotropic trap. For all practical purposes, it is necessary to extend the present calculations to include the effects of the kinetic energy pressure as well as the anisotropic trap.

This work is supported by the National Science Council, Taiwan under Grant NSC-88-2112-M-018-004.

- 
- [1] M.H. Anderson *et al.*, Science **269**, 198 (1995).
  - [2] C.C. Bradley *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1687 (1995).
  - [3] K.B. Davis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3969 (1995).
  - [4] D.M. Stamper-Kurn *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2027 (1998).
  - [5] T.-L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 742 (1998).
  - [6] T. Ohmi and K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **67**, 1822 (1998).
  - [7] C.K. Law, H. Pu, and N.P. Bigelow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5257 (1998).
  - [8] W.-J. Huang and S.-C. Gou, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4608 (1999).
  - [9] J. Stenger, *et al.*, Nature **396**, 345(1998).
  - [10] S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2360 (1996).
  - [11] T. Isoshima, K. Machida, and T. Ohmi, preprint *cond-mat/9905182*.